The New World Order

Menu Articles Articles Articles Articles God's Plan

9/11 official scenario: What about the pools of melted metal?

Jon Rappoport

I began by reading reports of melting dripping metal at the World Trade Center after the attack on September 11th.



Some of these reports come from weeks after the attack.

This seemed quite strange.

Following links, I arrived Dr. Steven Jones and his famous paper, "Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse?" Jones takes up this issue and much more. His paper is well worth reading.

Jones' approach goes beyond the argument about whether the buildings collapsed because the steel construction melted or just weakened.

The molten pools of metal are the anomaly. They need to be explained. Jones is arguing that these long-lasting pools wouldn't have resulted from burning jet fuel.

His conclusion, which he states needs further investigation, is that thermite charges were the cause of the pools. And why else would thermite be present in the buildings, except for the purpose of bringing them down?

I fully understand that all sorts of assertions have been made to explain the collapse of the buildings. And I'm sure people will write me with their assurances about what really happened on 9/11.

But in this article I'm simply pointing out that what appears to be confirmed observation of molten pools of structural metal from the WTC is a key.

Why? Because it cannot be explained or accounted for by the official 9/11 scenario.

Yes, there are other facts that can't be explained by the official scenario. The molten pools are one important fact, and Jones takes it up. Here are quotes from his paper:

"We start with the fact that large quantities of molten metal were observed in basement areas under rubble piles of all three buildings: the Twin Towers and WTC7."

"There are several published observations of molten metal in the basements of all threebuildings, WTC 1, 2 ("Twin Towers") and 7. For example, Dr. Keith Eaton toured Ground Zero and stated in *The Structural Engineer*, 'They showed us many fascinating slides' [Eaton] continued, 'ranging from molten metalwhich was still redhotweeks after the event, to 4-inch thick steel plates sheared

and bent in the disaster'. (Structural Engineer, September 3, 2002, p. 6.)"

"...the observed surface of this metal is still reddish orange

some six weeks after 9-11. This implies a large quantity of a metal with fairly low heat conductivity and a relatively large heat capacity (e.g., iron is more likely than aluminum) even in an underground location. Like magma in a volcanic cone, such metal might remain hot and molten for a long time — once the metal is sufficiently hot to melt in large quantities and then kept in a fairly-well insulated underground location. Moreover, as hypothesized below, thermite reactions may well have resulted in substantial quantities (observed in pools) of molten iron at very high temperatures — initially above 2,000 °C (3,632 °F). At these temperatures, various materials entrained in the molten metal pools will continue to undergo exothermic reactions which would tend to keep the pools hot for weeks despite radiative and conductive losses. Any thermite cutter charges which did not ignite during the collapse could also contribute to the prolonged heating."

Jones goes on to explain thermite reactions.

"I maintain that these observations are consistent with the use of high-temperature cutter charges such as thermite, HMX or RDX or some combination thereof, routinely used to melt/cut/demolish steel. [See Grimmer, 2004] Thermite is a mixture of iron oxide and aluminum powder. The end products of the thermite reaction are aluminum oxide and molten iron. So the thermite reaction generates molten iron directly, and is hot enough to melt and even evaporate steel which it contacts while reacting."

"Thermite contains its own supply of oxygen and so the reaction cannot be smothered, even with water. Use of sulfur in conjunction with the thermite, which we call "thermate," will accelerate the destructive effect on steel, and sulfidation of structural steel was indeed observed in some of the few recovered members from the WTC rubble, as reported in Appendix C of the FEMA report."

"On the other hand, falling buildings (absent incendiaries such as thermite) have insufficient directed energy to result in melting of large quantities of metal; any particles of molten metal somehow formed during collapse will not coalesce into molten pools of metal!"

"The government reports admit that the building fires were insufficient to melt steel beams—then where did the molten metal pools come from? Metals expert Dr. Frank Gayle (working

with NIST [National Institute of Standards and Technology]) stated: 'Your gut reaction would be the jet fuel is what made the fire

so very intense, a lot of people figured that's what melted the steel. Indeed it did not, the steel did not melt.' (Field, 2005; emphasis added.)"

"And in a fact sheet released in August, 2006, NIST states: "In no instance did NIST report that steel in the WTC towers melted due to the fires."

"None of the official reports tackles the mystery of the molten metal pools. Yet this is clearly a significant clue to what caused the Towers and WTC 7 to collapse. So an analysis of the composition of the previously-molten metal is required by a qualified scientific panel. This could well become an experiment crucis."

"Prof. Thomas Eagar explained in 2001 that the WTC fires would NOT melt steel: 'The fire is the most misunderstood part of the WTC collapse. Even today, the media report (and many scientists believe) that the steel melted. It is argued that the jet fuel burns very hot, especially with so much fuel present. This is not true....The

temperature of the fire at the WTC was not unusual, and it wasmostdefinitely not capable of melting steel...The maximum flame temperature increase for burning hydrocarbons (jet fuel) in air is, thus, about 1000 °C — hardly sufficient to melt steel at 1500 °C."

Newer Post	Home	Older Post